

sendmail 5.67/UCSD-2.2-sun
Tue, 3 Aug 93 04:30:13 -0700 for /usr/mail/listhandler ham-policy q
Message-Id: <9308031130.AA07050@ucsd.edu>
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 93 04:30:12 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #281
To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.EDU

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 3 Aug 93 Volume 93 : Issue 281

Today's Topics:

 Code/NoCode
 Code vs. No Code
 Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
 Real CBers

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 2 Aug 93 16:54:18 GMT
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!spool.mu.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
news.ecn.bgu.edu!psuvax1!vogon1!wa3wbu!frackit!ka3uzr!daveh@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code/NoCode
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Douglas Dever) writes:
>
> >In fact, if the
> >no-code license hadn't brought more people like me into the hobby,
> >how many bands do you think you'd have left.
>
> Since most of the no-clue licensees hang out exclusively on 2 meters,
> clearly the no-clue license has done little to "save our bandwidth"

> by populating those bands we were "in danger of losing" with new, no-clue
> hams. Your insinuation that without the no-clue license we would have less
> bandwidth is false.

>

Hey Rev, how about dropping the derogatory "no-clue" epithet. The proper license class is technician, but use no-code Technician if you have to distinguish them from the Technicians who have passed a CW test. Insulting these people doesn't help ham radio in any way. It may make you feel smug and superior, but I find it offensive. We should be welcoming all new hams, not alienating them!

>

> In this area, ARES is a joke. The section Emergency Coordinator rarely
> shows up for the statewide ARES net. Nobody has a clue as to what is
> going on. The last ARES net had two net-controls on the same
> repeater (when I asked "why", I was told "so someone who can't hear
> our net-control-south might be able to hear our net-control-north".
> Duhhh... McFly! Get a clue. Its a damn *repeater*. It has a defined
> coverage area. Everyone will be able to hear n-c-south.)

>

> I am very good friends with several law enforcement officials, many
> involved with disaster relief. Their opinion of ham-radio emergency
> services is all the same: its a waste. In fact, many believe that
> hams actually create *more* work for them, because with a bunch of
> untrained, i-think-i'm-so-important buffoons running around a
> disaster site, all they do is at the minimum get in the way of real
> disaster crews doing their job, and at the maximum end up getting
> themselves hurt or killed.

>

> And, I won't even *begin* to tell you the story about the no-clue
> who volunteered for the ARES position of Kent County DEC and now
> drives around in a circa-1974 Ford Pinto with, yes, you guessed
> it, a bar of flashing lights on the roof. Can you say "police
> authority wannabe?" Good, I knew you could. (Ever wonder what the
> local authorities think when he shows up? I'll tell you: They
> chuckle. He's the laughing stock.)

>

So what? All this proves is that there are jerks among the new licensees just as there are among the OFs. License class and morse code tests have absolutely no bearing on whether someone is going to act like a jerk. All you have to do is review QST, CQ, 73, etc. issues since the no-code license was approved. The people getting the fines, license suspensions, etc. are almost exclusively those

who passed a code test. In fact the number of 20wpm Extras that the FCC has nailed in the last two years leads me to believe that a morse code exam tests nothing, but the ability to copy morse code, PERIOD!

Dave Hultberg KA3UZR | vogon1!compnect!frackit!ka3uzr!daveh@psuvax1.psu.edu

Fidonet: 1:270/101.28 | Assistant Scoutmaster, Troop 196, Keystone Area Council

Brotherhood Member Susquehannock Lodge 11 \\\ \\\ \\\ | ASTA

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 08:26:13 UTC
From: pipex!uknet!mcsun!news.eunet.fi!anon.penet.fi@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code vs. No Code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I really everyone would get a life and get off this subject and realize that we are all amateur radio operators who have something to give. If we keep breaking up into little groups, then this hobby is not long for this country.

To find out more about the anon service, send mail to help@anon.penet.fi. Due to the double-blind, any mail replies to this message will be anonymized, and an anonymous id will be allocated automatically. You have been warned. Please report any problems, inappropriate use etc. to admin@anon.penet.fi.

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 01:52:35 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srigenprp!alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

nuts2u::little (little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com) wrote:
: Why *is* the question pool published? ...

I think the reason is that, way back when, Dick Bash and others were already compiling and selling the "secret" question pools. By making the questions available officially, it no longer gave the advantage to those willing to "cheat."

: Perhaps a better option is to try and make the pool large enough to make
: memorizing the questions self defeating. ...

I think that was the original objective. Unfortunately, it takes time and energy on the FCC's part to review and maintain the question pools, with the result that (IMHO) the number of questions is marginal.

AL N1AL

Date: 2 Aug 93 17:12:26 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!news.ecn.bgu.edu!
psuvax1!vogon1!wa3wbu!frackit!ka3uzr!daveh@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Real CBers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>
> The problem with this is that you get people who came in under the
> no-code license, then scream because they want HF access without any
> additional effort. Hence, clueless. :)

Ah, I see, lets through out the no-code license because some of them offend your sensibilities. Give me a break Tony. You are going to hurt yourself jumping to conclusions. Because some no-code Techs (percentage unknown) have starting asking for HF priviledges, you conclude that they are all (or at least a majority are) "no-clues". Maybe we should brand all Extras with the same sort of term for the actions of Herbie, the 14.313 gang, etc.? Why don't you take all the energy your wasting her pissing and moaning and file your request with the FCC. If there are en enough hams out there who share your views, you might even get what you want. Or do you just like to hear yourself bitch?

Dave Hultberg KA3UZR | vogon1!compnect!frackit!ka3uzr!daveh@psuvax1.psu.edu
Fidonet: 1:270/101.28 | Assistant Scoutmaster, Troop 196, Keystone Area Council

Brotherhood Member Susquehannock Lodge 11 \\\ / \\\ / \\\ / | ASTA

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #281

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 93 17:42:03 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: around....around....around....around....
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul28.071127.4977@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>What you say is true, but how much of it is self selection bias?
>There are simple one chip FM transmitter designs, and simple one
>chip FM reciever designs suitable for repeater access, but we rarely
>see such in QST. It's the same old 40 meter CW circuit instead.

>There are simple RTTY TU designs available, but we find another
>20 meter CW transceiver design inside. Phasing SSB is now practical
>with easily available chips, but we find an 80 meter DC receiver
>optimized for CW inside.

Don't see interesting articles in QST? Write one!

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

Date: 2 Aug 93 14:13:28 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!dragon!nj8j!ben@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code/NoCode
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> In this area, ARES is a joke.
 ^^^^^^^^^^^^
> When it comes to emergency services, amateurs have this noble,
> conceited concept on how they are "so important" to the disaster
> relief effort of communities. I hate to break it to you, you're not.

As you indicated, this varies widely by location. Back in my old home location (Marion County, WV), the county emergency services official is definitely interested in having amateur radio involved. Of course, it may have made a difference that he'd been involved in response to the widespread flooding in WV in November 1985, and had seen amateur radio emergency services in action.

I'm wondering - are you satisfied with the situation in your area? Does it bother you that in other areas, amateur radio is a definite part of disaster relief planning, while in your area, a few self-important bozos have rendered ARES a joke? Have you tried to do anything about it?

Emergency communications is one of the reasons amateur radio even exists. If you value your license, how do you manage to be satisfied with a situation that helps remove one of the reasons for your even having that license?

Ben

+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J | "All that is not eternal is |
| AX.25: NJ8J@W4QO.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA | eternally irrelevant." |

| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us | C. S. Lewis |
+-----+

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 16:16:00 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!gatech!
wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug2.225832.14836@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>Why *is* the question pool published? The only reason I've heard given is
>that it ensures that the applicant receives an officially sanctioned exam.
>That sounds like an excuse as opposed to a reason. If the VEC and VE teams
>can't be trusted to give proper exams, then why are we trusting them to
>administer them in the first place?

As Reagan used to say, "Trust but verify." Having the pool public allows
public verification of the trustworthiness of particular VE run exams.

>Perhaps a better option is to try and make the pool large enough to make
>memorizing the questions self defeating. I suggested before that a
>question generator program be used as it could surely handle a large
>majority of the current question pool.

Now that's a good idea. Anyone who can memorize the *answers*, not
the letter choice (that should be shuffled with each exam), to 500 or
1000 potential questions has undoubtedly earned their license. Something
is bound to stick.

That's the way the FAA exams, and the old commercial radio operator
license exams worked. Anyone remember the old Q&A manuals? Every
question in the pool was in that 800 page book, but if you could
memorize that, you'd really be doing something.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 3 Aug 1993 09:58:13 -0700
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Steve Popovich (popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com) wrote:

: Given the relative performances of the VEC and the DXCC Desk lately,
: it seems that either the VEC staffers have been working on DXCC, or
: they've been spending a lot of their time making STRONG coffee to keep
: those DXCC guys working. :-) Congratulations to the League on clearing
: the DXCC backlog; now, how about clearing the license backlog? Then,
: if they'd only send some of that coffee to the NYC/LI Section Manager
: to get him to answer his mail more often than once every couple of
: months...:-) [Is this a common problem with SCMs? Volunteering and
: then deciding they don't want the job?]

: It seems like priorities are being misplaced when license applications
: sit around longer than award applications that require at least 100
: @#\$\$%* QSL cards to be hand-checked. Sigh.
: -Steve, WB3I

THERE you have it! First Things First at the ARRL,
The Association for Retarding Radio Licensing!

Gene

x
--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares
are destined to plow for those who don't.
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.firmhere

Date: 3 Aug 1993 18:29:41 GMT
From: olivea!news.bbn.com!bbn.com!levin@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Welford) writes:

|Steve Popovich (popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com) wrote:
|: Given the relative performances of the VEC and the DXCC Desk lately,
|: it seems that either the VEC staffers have been working on DXCC,. . .
|THERE you have it! First Things First at the ARRL,
|The Association for Retarding Radio Licensing!

Under the rules by which VECs are allowed to exist, the ARRL VEC organization is somewhat separated from the ARRL, at least as far as day-to-day operations are concerned.

It is unlikely that the effort the DXCC people put into catching up on their backlog had any effect on the VEC operation.

The main problem remains the length of time applications take to go through the FCC office in Gettysburg.

/JBL kd1on

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com		"There were sweetheart roses on Yancey Wilmerding's
POTS: (617)873-3463		bureau that morning. Wide-eyed and distraught, she
KD10N (@KB4N.NH.USA)		stood with all her faculties rooted to the floor."
		-- S. J. Perelman

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 93 16:38:28 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul27.172718.23080@newsgate.sps.mot.com> rapw20@email.sps.mot.com writes:

>Does anyone else have problems decoding the . and - CW that people
>have been posting in this thread? I mean, I can copy 20 or so wpm by
>ear but have a difficult time with the 'written' CW. I have to hum
>it to myself before I can 'copy' it. I guess once you learn it in one
>sensory medium it's difficult to transfer it to another.

The guy I share an office with has been sitting there, wondering why I'm whispering "didah dah dah didididit didit dididit" to myself...

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 93 16:01:39 GMT

From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <eya97B9w165w@nraven.wariat.org>, <23bgv2INNd11@network.ucsd.edu>,
<CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>rd
Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

In article <CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:
>In article <23bgv2INNd11@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor)
writes:

>>and if your non-membership is a symbol of
>>your disgust with the organization, be sure you have told them so.
>I did just this in the form of a letter to Dave Sumner. He didn't even
>bother to reply...further adding to my disgust.

Uh, Jim...just what would you like Dave to have said? For that amttter, what
COULD he say? Is there anything he could have said that would have changed
your mind?

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

Date: 3 Aug 1993 15:10:22 GMT
From: olivea!news.bbn.com!bbn.com!levin@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <DRT.93Jul29102654@cacciatore.mit.edu>, <CAyD47.73H@fc.hp.com>,
<m5st9hINNipj@news.bbn.com>.n
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

I'm following up on my own post, since I realized that of course
while

|I guess the winning USA call would be AE5E. In units that would be
| A E 5 E
| 5+3 + 1+3 + 9+3 + 1+7 = 32 units. Not bad.

this would be tied with NE5E and N5EE.

| /JBL KD10N (= 9+3+7+3+17+3+11+3+5+7 = 68)

|=

|Nets: levin@bbn.com | "Earn more sessions by sleeving."
|pots: (617)873-3463 |

|KD10N (@KB4N.NH.USA) |

-- Roxanne Kowalski

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 93 16:05:45 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<1993Aug02.165536.14244@news.mentorg.com>, <CB6LKw.FL4@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

In article <CB6LKw.FL4@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:
>I was an ARRL member for 12 years. I got so disgusted that I decided it wasn't
>worth \$30 more to me... I never got any positive response to any letters or
>comments in the 12 years I was a member. I decided to have fun being a ham
>instead... I spent my \$30 on repeater parts.

That's one advantage I have over you: my \$240 life membership (paid off in
1979) has long since paid for itself. I get to bitch for free. :-)

What did you buy for the machine that only cost \$30??!

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

Date: 3 Aug 1993 14:24:49 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!library.ucla.edu!ddsw1!news.kei.com!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!news.bbn.com!bbn.com!
levin@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9307280120.AA01327@netmail.microsoft.com>,
<DRT.93Jul29102654@cacciatore.mit.edu>, <CAyD47.73H@fc.hp.com>bia.ed
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:

|David R Tucker (drt@athena.mit.edu) wrote:

|: So, K G 2 S
|: is 9+3 + 9+3 + 15+3 + 5+7 = 54 units long
|
|: Length = 2*(dits+chars) + 4*(dahs+words)
|

|: So, AH6MM = 2*(9+5) + 4*(6+1) = 56

|OK, let me get this straight then -

|AA0ET = 2*(3+5) + 4*(8+1) = 16+36 = 52 (on par with 1x2/2x1s!)

|I really wish I didn't live in region 0 - what a drag. I slam the right
|paddle over and try to keep from snoring.

I guess the winning USA call would be AE5E. In units that would be

A E 5 E
5+3 + 1+3 + 9+3 + 1+7 = 32 units. Not bad.

/JBL KD10N (= 9+3+7+3+17+3+11+3+5+7 = 68)
ex-N1MNF (= 5+3+17+3+7+3+5+3+9+7 = 62 oh well)

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com | "Earn more sessions by sleeving."

pots: (617)873-3463 |

KD10N (@KB4N.NH.USA) |

-- Roxanne Kowalski

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 11:36:31 GMT

From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!jreese@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <23bgv2INNd11@network.ucsd.edu>, <CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<1993Aug02.165536.14244@news.mentorg.com>~

Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

In article <1993Aug02.165536.14244@news.mentorg.com> Hank_Oredson@mentorg.com
writes:

>Although I tend to agree with the ideas above, I choose to
>remain a member, and try and help vote out the folks that do
>not represent my views, and help to vote in the folks who do.
>

>Remaining a member MAY result in better response from HQ, but
>this has NOT been my experience.

I was an ARRL member for 12 years. I got so disgusted that I decided it wasn't
worth \$30 more to me... I never got any positive response to any letters or
comments in the 12 years I was a member. I decided to have fun being a ham
instead... I spent my \$30 on repeater parts.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Bad times bring out the best in Texans, good times
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | bring out the worst." --Molly Ivins

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 93 18:51:20 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Pine.3.07.9308021206.A22263-9100000@uafhp.uark.edu>,
<1993Aug2.225832.14836@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <1993Aug3.161600.5873@ke4zv.uucp>p
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah

In article <1993Aug3.161600.5873@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>That's the way the FAA exams, and the old commercial radio operator
>license exams worked. Anyone remember the old Q&A manuals? Every
>question in the pool was in that 800 page book, but if you could
>memorize that, you'd really be doing something.

The FAA question pools are in the 1000- to 1200-question range, and are
published without answers. The third-party Q&A books you can buy all have the
answers furnished by the book's publisher, and they disagree with each other
in more than a few instances...

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 93 18:47:53 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul29.122119.9251@ee.surrey.ac.uk>,
<930730.111225.8M3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,
<1993Aug1.000529.5299@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: Real CBers

In article <1993Aug1.000529.5299@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr.
Nice Guy) writes:

>The clueless ones are hams without a degree in electrical engineering!
>Many fools can learn Morse but it takes about 4 years of collage to get
>the engineering degree.

The clueless ones are hams without 20 WPM code! Many fools can get an EE degree
but it takes perseverance to get to 20.

>There are tyo classes of hams the Technicianas and the Clueless Coded

There are two classes of hams: the 20 WPMs and the clueless EEs.

>No, we think that 13 wmp is harassment, set the morse at 5 wpm.

No, we think that all of those courses that have nothing to do with engineering are harassment, get rid of them!

It's so much fun throwing arguments back at people..._EVERY*_ argument against the code requirement can be used equally against the requirements for unrelated courses for a college degree.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #282
